



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

## WHAT COUNTRIES BENEFIT BY THE MONROE DOCTRINE?

ADDRESS OF JOSEPH WHELESS,  
*Member of the Bar of St. Louis, Mo.*

In his recent address before the University of Buenos Aires, ex-President Roosevelt said of the Monroe Doctrine that "it is a doctrine which the United States promulgated, partly as a matter of policy in its own interest, partly as a matter of policy in the interest of all the republics of the New World." The prime matter of policy in the interest of the United States, which dictated its promulgation, is distinctly stated by President Monroe, in his message, to be, that the United States should consider any attempt on the part of the Powers of the Holy Alliance to extend their system to any portion of this hemisphere as "dangerous to our peace and safety." Such apprehensions of the effect on the United States of the establishment of absolute European governments in South America may have been substantial, in 1823; although the real home base of such autocracies in Europe was geographically much closer to the United States, and much more potentially dangerous to its peace and safety, than could have been any branch autocracies which they might have set up in the vast unoccupied territories of South America. However may have been the condition then, nearly a century ago, there are those now in the United States who (mistakenly, I opine) decry the Monroe Doctrine as "an obsolete shibboleth" and demand its abandonment; one writer denounces the Monroe Doctrine in the precise words of President Monroe towards the system of the Holy Alliance, as "dangerous to our national peace and safety," and he deprecates it as a continuing bar to the civilization of Latin America. A prominent member of Congress has recently written me that he regards the Monroe Doctrine as more of a liability than an asset of the United States. So that it would appear, with some reason, that the United States is not one of the countries which most benefits, unless in an altruistic and Pickwickian sense, by the maintenance of the doctrine promulgated by President Monroe.

As to that part of the policy of the Monroe Doctrine which was in the interest of all the republics of the New World, there can be no doubt who are the chief beneficiaries. Let us recall precisely what

are the terms of the Monroe Doctrine, as succinctly and authoritatively stated in the text of President Monroe's historic message of December 2, 1823. It embraces two separate but correlated propositions—(the first addressed to Russia, the other to the Holy Alliance)—the essential words of which are:

I. \* \* \* the American continents \* \* \* are henceforth not to be considered as subjects for future colonization by any European Powers. \* \* \*

II. \* \* \* we could not view any interposition for the purpose of oppressing them, or controlling in any other manner their destiny, by any European Power, in any other light than as the manifestation of an unfriendly disposition towards the United States.

The foregoing simple propositions are "the whole of the law and the prophets" of the Monroe Doctrine. "There was an element of prophetic inspiration," says a distinguished Colombian, writing recently under the pseudonym of A. de Manos-Albas, "in the declaration of President Monroe, uttered in 1823. It rang through the world like a peal of thunder; it paralyzed the Holy Alliance, and defined, once and for all time, as far as Europe is concerned, the international status of the newly constituted American republics." With the utmost enthusiasm and gratitude was the message hailed by the Latin American states; their governments, and the heroes of their independence, declared their hearty approbation of its principles. Bolívar proposed it for general ratification at his projected Panamá Congress, in 1826; and from that date, says Señor Alejandro Álvarez, the Chilean publicist,—who repeatedly calls it "the political gospel of the New World,"—"all the Latin states have not only striven to proclaim it solemnly but also to unite to make it respected," for, he adds, "it expressed the aspirations of all America." "These principles," says the distinguished Spanish publicist, García Moreno, "were universally accepted in the opinion of the people of the American republics, and the Monroe Doctrine was thus converted into a principle of American public law." The brilliant Peruvian, García Calderón, in his celebrated new work, *Les Démocraties Latines de l'Amérique*, says, in grudging admission of the truth:

The United States proclaimed the autonomy of the continent and contributed to the preservation of the originality of southern America, by forbidding the formation of colonies within its vacant territories, by defending republican and democratic states against reactionary Europe.

Before the Fourth Pan-American Conference, Dr. de la Plaza, Argentine Minister of Foreign Affairs, recognized the same truth :

This condition of precarious autonomy and liberty of action, and the constant danger of being subjugated or suffering the mutilation of their territory, would have continued among those weak states but for the wise and famous declarations of President Monroe, to which we ought to render due homage.

A final word of Latin American encomium of the Monroe Doctrine may be cited in the words of the eminent Argentinian, Dr. Luís M. Drago, author of the celebrated "doctrine" which bears his name, who has recently said before this Society :

The Monroe Doctrine is in fact a formula of independence. It imposes no dominion and no superiority. Much less does it establish protectorates or relation of superior to inferior. It creates no obligations and no responsibilities between the nations of America, but simply calls upon all of them, with their own means and without foreign aid, to exclude from within their respective frontiers the jurisdiction of European Powers. Proclaimed by the United States in the interest of their own peace and security, the other republics of the continent have in their turn proceeded to adopt it with an eye alone to their own individual welfare and tranquility. \* \* \* Thus understood, the Monroe Doctrine, which in the end is nothing more than the expression of the will of the people to maintain their liberty, assures the independence of the states of that continent in respect to one another as well as in relation to the Powers of Europe.

Very evident it is from the preceding authoritative expressions, that the countries of Latin America recognize that they have been the chief beneficiaries of the North American Doctrine of Monroe. On the initiative of the late Ambassador Nabuco, sanctioned by the Government of Brazil, a formal acknowledgment of this recognition of benefits was sought to be made by the nations of Latin America

assembled in the Fourth Pan-American Congress, at Buenos Aires, in 1910. As drafted by the distinguished statesman, the resolution recited that "Latin America sends to her great sister nation of the north an expression of her thanks for that noble and unselfish action which has been of such great benefit to the entire New World." Unfortunately, this generous and just design failed of final expression, for the reason, as stated by Señor Álvarez, of a fear on the part of some of the delegates, "that, while approving it, they might sanction along with it many acts of hegemony committed by the United States by which more than one country had felt its sovereign dignity to have been wounded."

Such apprehensions, says Señor Álvarez, arise from a serious confusion of ideas in the minds of many persons, even statesmen and writers on international law, as to what is the Monroe Doctrine; they confuse with it and attribute to it every action and policy of the United States having any relation to Latin America. "Publicists," he says, "have not only failed to see the real origin and nature of the doctrine, but have disfigured its true meaning"; and he adds: "For the majority of persons, it is the basis of the policy of hegemony which the United States is developing on the American continent," points of view, he says, which are inadmissible. "Distinctions should be made," declares the writer, "between (1) the Monroe Doctrine in its primitive form; (2) the hegemony of the United States on the American continent; and (3) the imperialistic policy of that nation." This is not the occasion to enter upon such discussion; these distinctions are simply pointed out to be borne in mind in considering the admitted benefits of the Monroe Doctrine, "in its primitive form," to Latin America.

Numerous instances might be cited of the beneficent operation of the Monroe Doctrine in protecting the independent and territorial integrity of the countries of the southern continent. Besides paralyzing the Holy Alliance in its designs upon the newly acquired liberties of those countries, the Monroe Doctrine has been the shield and buckler of Latin American autonomy from 1823 to the present time, to specify only the instances of the French intervention in Mexico, the Spanish expeditions against Ecuador and against Santo Domingo, the British controversy with Venezuela, and joint operations of England, Germany and Italy against the same country, the joint foreign demonstra-

tion against Santo Domingo, and numerous instances in Central America.

As a ward against European aggression, the Monroe Doctrine is not yet "obsolete." Señor Álvarez recognizes it as still the welcome defense and protection of Latin American independence and integrity, saying: "These states not only do not reject it, but have sought and will always seek protection under it whenever it may operate for their protection." The Peruvian, Señor Calderón, terrified by the specter which he raises before himself of a Japanese invasion and conquest of Latin America "to erect there a new Japan," takes comfort to his fears, exclaiming: "The Monroe Doctrine, which liberated Latin America from the tutelage of the Holy Alliance, is perhaps destined to protect it also against the Orient."

In his chapter entitled *La Menace Japonaise*, he says, "her statesmen and publicists consider that Perú, Chile and Mexico are lands for Japanese expansion," and he gloomily predicts "a struggle between half-breed America and stoical Japan, in which the former will lose its autonomy and its traditions." He begins his chapter *Le Danger Allemand* with the fearsome words: "The Teutonic invasion disquiets the Hispano-American writers. The tutelary protection of the United States does not suffice to make them forget the European peril." Elsewhere he dwells upon the fact that "tenacious Teutonic colonizers" flow into Brazil, Chile and other countries of South and Central America, and declares "the German danger remains." History has been a long record of the expansion of active and populous nations at the expense of weaker and less populated states; and there is nothing to indicate that this movement has reached its final period. Indeed, the struggle for expansion for overflowing populations is reaching its most acute stage. The possibility of a "scramble for South America" does not exist alone in the fears of some South American theorists. Practical men of state openly express such fear, and some of the land-hungry have been frank to avow their annoyance with the restraints of the Monroe Doctrine. The bitterest denunciation of the Monroe Doctrine comes from Germany and France, whose much needed expansion is arrested by its "fiat." Germany, France, Spain, formerly England, and now Italy, are in constant warring operations to hold their seizures of the blazing and blasted deserts and deadly jungles of Africa. Would they hesitate long if an opening offered for a "scramble" for the

luxuriant regions and virgin wealth of Latin America? An English writer in the *Nineteenth Century Magazine*, December, 1896,—the time of the first Venezuela squabble,—speaks cynically of the alluring possibilities in what he calls “a scramble for South America,” and avers “if it once begins, neither the latent resources nor the moral influence of the United States will avail to protect its clients without the display of effective military strength.”

Again an English writer, Mr. Somers Somerset, in the same magazine, for April, 1903, at the time of the later Venezuela troubles, defines the “new economic necessities” which look toward Latin America for a solution, and says:

In proportion as the available surface of the earth that is suitable for colonization decreases, it becomes more and more evident that not only is there no time to be lost in founding an empire, but that the price which a people may be able to allow itself to pay for the acquisition of that territory is greatly rising. The constant pressure of the peoples of Europe, the commercial struggle, and the natural desire for national aggrandizement are bound to be powerful factors; and the consideration of “now or never” will very soon mark the policy of various European chancelleries. We have already seen that the Old World offers few attractions—there remains only the New World to be considered.

The veto of the Monroe Doctrine, in the opinion of this writer, has up to this time saved the Latin American countries from European aggression; but he adds: “It must be remembered that during that time the world afforded many opportunities for colonization in other regions, and that that period is drawing to its close, and it is scarcely to be expected that a mere formula or opinion will continue to protect those countries for long.” That this is a real condition, and not a theory, is the belief of the most accredited Latin American statesmen. “The events in Venezuela,” says Dr. Juan A. García, at the time, “are not isolated facts, measures of policy, or reparation of wrongs, but the opportunity which materialized a tendency latent in Europe since the middle of the past century which in the past years has been emphasized and fortified by the new economic necessities.” This subject is treated at length and very seriously by Dr. Luís M. Drago, in a recent explanation of his action in 1902 in appealing to the protection of the Monroe Doctrine in behalf of Venezuela as against the aggres-

sion of England, Germany and Italy. His note to the United States pointed out, he says:

a danger that lay very near and aimed to forestall it. At the time when it was transmitted everything combined to inspire the greatest alarm. There was rife in political and diplomatic circles a constant agitation which was dominated, and was disseminated by the greatest newspapers of the world, the most important and best accredited reviews and the books of thoughtful men, and which pointed out these countries as the best fields for the colonial expansion of the great Powers, once the doors of Africa and the Orient were closed.

Thinkers of the highest rank have suggested the advisability of turning in this direction the great efforts which the principal Powers of Europe have hitherto made for the conquest of sterile regions, with rigorous climate, lying in the most distant corners of the world. There are also many European writers that point out the countries of South America with their great wealth, with their sunny skies and propitious climates, as the natural theater where the great Powers with their arms and instruments prepared for conquest have yet in the course of this century to dispute dominion. \* \* \* The act of coercion attempted against Venezuela seemed consequently to be the beginning of the hostilities predicted against America.

Writing about a year ago in the *English Review of Reviews*, Señor A. de Manos-Albas calls Latin America "a tempting field for expansion," and frankly states the incentives which the American El Dorado offers to the avidity of the land-grabbing expansionists of Europe:

The territorial responsibilities of the Latin American nations are greatly in excess of their respective populations. The seventeen republics from Mexico to Cape Horn, with an area of several times that of Central Europe, contain at best seventy million inhabitants, who could be comfortably housed in any one of the larger republics, leaving the immense remaining territory available for European expansion. Can Tripoli compare with the broad and fertile plains of Northern Venezuela, bordering on the Caribbean? Or Morocco with the Atlantic coast section of Colombia? Can the Congo compare favorably with the Amazon, or Madagascar or West Africa with the inner lands of Perú, of Bolivia, or of Ecuador?

The consideration of such possibilities implies no wanton spirit of alarmism. If Tripoli has been thought worth Italy's present



effort, and Morocco France's recent venture, why should not the infinitely richer Caribbean coast fare likewise? No one in his senses, surely, would outrage the Powers by supposing that their abstention has been prompted by moral considerations; their reputation is too well established.

From the foregoing, which are but a few of many similar expressions of covetous desires towards the teeming possibilities of Latin America, and of almost panic fear of overt realization, may be better appreciated the significance of the avowal of Señor Álvarez, when he frankly declares the reality of these fears and the only hope of salvation, saying:

The Monroe Doctrine, far from being a thing of the past, as some publicists pretend, is still of present importance, in the sense that it denies the existence of territories *nullius* in the American continent, territories which could be acquired through occupation by European countries.

The question, "What countries benefit by the Monroe Doctrine?" is effectively answered out of the mouths of its most authoritative beneficiaries. As the Monroe Doctrine, the traditional policy of the United States, has so far saved Latin America for the Latin Americans, so it may be a hopeful augury for them that "Monroeism persists indefinitely," as complained by Señor Calderón. But suppose that it should cease to persist. Suppose that the United States should take counsel of Dr. Hiram Bingham, and announce to the land-hungry nations of Europe: "We abandon the Monroe Doctrine." That means that we withdraw from and renounce henceforth our traditional policy to prevent European acquisition of territory and colonization in America. "All comers are welcome, and what they do or take is none of our business." Not one of those who so passionately assail the Monroe Doctrine and call for its abandonment, can for a moment ignore what would follow,—in a generation there would not be any Latin American "sovereignty" left alive in America. All honest minded men must admit, that but for the policy, be it called "Monroe Doctrine" or what not, which the United States has pursued, there would beyond all reasonable doubt be no Latin America to complain, through a confusion of ideas, of the Monroe Doctrine, and South America would have ceased to be even a geographical name, but "New

Europe" and "Yanquilandia" would have adorned the map of the Western Hemisphere even in the geographies of the past generation. But for the fateful "Thou-shalt-not" of the United States, the modern history of the world would have been very different, and what is called Latin America would have been more European than Africa is today or is ever destined to become—more English, and German, and French and Italian than North America is a composite of them all,—and civilization might not have suffered by the change.

The CHAIRMAN. I wish to disassociate myself with the various mispronunciations of the great word which was introduced and mispronounced by Mr. Adams and which has continued to be introduced and mispronounced by each of the speakers.

In a much appreciated and highly imaginative speech, Mr. Henry Grattan, speaking of the parliament of Ireland, said: "I rocked the cradle and I followed the hearse."

If it can not be said exactly that Mr. Charles Francis Adams, who honored us by his presence two nights ago, rocked the cradle of the doctrine, the cradle was nevertheless rocked by one of his kin; and we have with us today Professor Hiram Bingham, of Yale University, who will, I opine, follow the hearse. I call upon Mr. Bingham, and with very great pleasure introduce him to you as the last speaker on this subject this morning.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Chairman and fellow-mourners: It was with very great pleasure that I received an invitation from your Secretary to present to this Society what I believe to be the attitude of Latin America towards the Monroe Doctrine. I have listened this morning with very great interest to a very clear analysis of the situation. Professor Hull's paper sums up in a more clear and complete fashion than any paper to which I have ever listened or which I have ever read the difficulties of the situation and of the different aspects of supporting the doctrine of peace.

If the Monroe Doctrine is nothing more than a doctrine of peace. I hope I shall never have to follow the hearse; but I fear, from what I have heard in many parts of the world, that it is something more than a doctrine of peace.

The last speaker would have us believe that Europe is held in leash

simply by our "Thou shalt not," and if we were to go back on the Monroe Doctrine or change its antiquated or time honored policy the poor lambs and mice in Latin America would instantly be gobbled up by the lion and the bear and the other animals on the other side of the ocean.

Whether that be so or not is not my privilege to discuss, for I have not been invited to do more than to present to you what I believe to be the attitude of a majority of the people in Latin America. It is quite true that there is a strong minority in Latin America, some of whom you have just heard quoted, who are in favor of this doctrine. It is equally true that there is a minority of people in this country who are opposed to the doctrine.

## THE LATIN AMERICAN ATTITUDE TOWARD THE MONROE DOCTRINE

ADDRESS OF HIRAM BINGHAM,  
*Yale University*

There is a feeling among some of those who are firm believers in the Monroe Doctrine that we are in danger of misrepresenting the Latin American attitude toward this doctrine, and of exaggerating its importance.

An instance of this occurs in the Baltimore *Evening Sun* of April 7, where a lawyer who had previously addressed the American Academy of Political and Social Science writes as follows:

It has become of vogue in recent years among a certain class of oracular school men and scholastic statesmen in the United States, who take no account of the lessons of history, and ignore the plain facts of the present, to decry and condemn the Monroe Doctrine, thus giving aid and comfort to its detractors abroad and fomenting the misunderstanding and ill will of which they claim it is the cause in our international relations. Conspicuous examples of the anti-Monroe Doctrinaires who add fuel to the otherwise innocuous flame of hostile criticism are Prof. Hugo Munsterberg, of Harvard, who decries "the error and folly of the moribund doctrine"; and Prof. Hiram Bingham, of Yale, in whose booklet, which he dubs "The Monroe Doctrine, an Obsolete Shibboleth," he compiles and magnifies every hostile criticism that he can gather from alien tongue and pen.